

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action dated September 8, 2004. Applicant has amended the claims to clarify key features of the invention and overcome the claim objections and rejections. No new matter has been added, and the amendments place the claims in better condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments to the claims. The discussion/arguments provided below reference the claims in their amended form.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

At paragraph 4 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-3, 10-14 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mora, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,113) in view of *Saito, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,599,324).

At paragraph 5 of the present Office Action, Claims 4-9, 15-18, 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mora* in view of *Saito* as applied to Claims 1 and 12, and further in view of *Swaminathan, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,726).

Neither of the above combinations renders Applicant's claimed invention unpatentable because neither combination suggests to one skilled in the art the subject matter of Applicant's claims as to render the claimed subject matter obvious. Applicant respectfully requests Examiner reconsider the above rejections in light of the present amendments clarifying Applicant's claimed invention. Specifically, the independent claims now recite:

"adding a summary information field to each document with relevant summary information for that document, said summary information including information about a percentage completion of a particular task/subtask represented by the particular document; and when a save operation is performed on one of the second level documents, dynamically updating the summary information field of the first level document to include relevant summary information from said one second level document that is saved" (emphases added).

Mora, Saito, and Swaminathan are all devoid of any teaching of or suggestion to provide information about a percentage completed of a particular task within a summary information

field of a task document. All three references also fail to teach or suggest passing that summary information up one level for updating the higher level document when the lower level document is being saved.

Additionally, several dependent claims provide features not suggested by the combination of references. For example, Claim 4 recites:

“automatically determining a point total and completed point total for all tasks and subtasks affiliated with said project; and dynamically calculating a current completion percentage complete of said task utilizing a sum of the completed point total for subtasks associated with the particular task and dynamically calculating a current completion percentage of said project utilizing said point total for the project and a sum of and said completed point total for each task within the project” (emphases added).

Again, *Mura*, *Saito*, and *Swaminathan* are devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the above features. Neither the references individually nor either of the combinations provide any suggestion of automatically determining a point total and dynamically calculating a completion percentage using the sum of the completed point total of the documents one level below the calculation point.

Given the above reasons, it is clear that neither combination of references suggests several key features of Applicant's invention. Thus, one skilled in the art would not find Applicant's invention unpatentable over the combination of references. Applicant's claims are therefore allowable over the combinations.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has diligently responded to the Office Action by amending the claims to clarify features within specific claims and overcome claim objections. Since the amendments and supporting arguments overcome the §103 rejections, Applicant, respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending.

Applicant also requests the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney of record at 512.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Eustace P. Isidore
Reg. No. 56,104
Dillon & Yudell LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)